

DEC 8 1921

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XV, No. 7

MONDAY, November 28, 1921

WHOLE NO. 403

Classical Associations of Places in Italy

by FRANCES E. SABIN, Assistant Professor of Latin
at University of Wisconsin

A collection of approximately 575 passages from Greek and Latin authors arranged under the headings of places in Italy with the best available English translation on the opposite page and explanatory notes at the bottom; also a map at the beginning of the book connecting ancient and modern sites, and various illustrations throughout the text in connection with places mentioned.

PURPOSE OF THE BOOK

The book is designed primarily to meet the needs of the intelligent traveler in Italy who wishes to have at hand in some convenient form the classical associations of the places which he visits. But, apart from the purpose of making a trip to Italy more interesting, the book also serves as a collection of passages which set forth the life and thought of the Romans. It will therefore be a useful book for libraries in general and for departments of the Classics and ancient history in particular.

PUBLICATION AND PRICE

Because of the excessive cost of bringing out a book of this character at the present time, it has not seemed advisable to have a large edition printed or to have it handled in the usual way. Seven hundred copies are available at present. These may be secured from **Frances E. Sabin, 405 N. Henry St., Madison, Wis.**
Price \$5.00.

A descriptive circular will be sent upon request.

*Do not allow
your pupils
to forget.*

**Collar and Daniell's
First Year Latin, Revised**

has a review scheme so thorough that a teacher cannot fail to get results.

At the back of the book are sets of review questions on each lesson, dealing with syntax, forms, derivations and principles.

These are in addition to all the skillful reviews throughout the book and the ten definite review lessons.

Ginn and Company

Boston New York Chicago London
Atlanta Dallas Columbus San Francisco

DRILL IN THE GUISE OF A GAME

With **Hurlbut and Bradley's Notebook for First Year Vocabulary**, pupils can review their Latin vocabulary in a classroom game which is something like the old-fashioned spelling bee. Experience has shown that this is an ideal way of fastening the words in the pupil's memory.

The Notebook contains 650 carefully selected words that pupils must know at the end of the first year. On the right hand page the space is left blank for the pupil to write the English meanings.

The words are classified under nouns, adjectives, verbs, etc., and again subdivided by declensions, conjugations, etc.

The game is easily played; its results are excellent.

NOTEBOOK FOR FIRST YEAR LATIN VOCABULARY

By STEPHEN A. HURLBUT, M.A., Latin Master, Clark School, New York, N.Y. and BARCLAY W. BRADLEY, Ph.D., Instructor in Latin, College of the City of New York. Manila, 96 pp. Teacher's Handbook separate.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XV, No. 7

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1921

WHOLE NO. 403

VERGIL, AENEID 6. 391 ff

Corpora viva nefas Stygia vectare carina.
Nec vero Alciden me sum laetus euntem
acepisse lacu, nec Theseu Pirithoumque,
dis quamquam geniti atque invicti viribus essent.
Tartareum ille manu custodem in vincla petivit
ipsius a solo regis traxitque trementem;
hi dominam Ditis thalamo deducere adorti.

The comment of Servius on these words of Charon has profoundly affected the interpretation of the passage, possibly in a way that he did not intend. At any rate the editors seem quite in agreement that, with the words *Nec . . . sum laetus*, Charon refers to the punishment inflicted upon himself for allowing the heroes named in the text to cross in his skiff. A typical note from a School edition reads as follows: "When Hercules went into the lower world to bring up Cerberus, Charon, being terrified, carried him at once over the Styx, and, as a punishment, was imprisoned a year by the command of Pluto".

But, if the opening line of the passage embodies a binding rule, and Charon is represented as punished because he broke it and transported 'living bodies' in his boat under the pressure of extenuating circumstances (394), it is hard to see why Vergil added the last three lines quoted above. Surely he could assume that his Roman readers would need no instruction as to the errands calling the heroes mentioned to the lower world.

There is a still more serious difficulty in the reply of the Sibyl, 399 ff.:

Nullae hic insidiae tales (absiste moveri),
nec vim tela ferunt; licet ingens ianitor antro
aeternum latrans exsanguis terrat umbras,
casta licet patrui servet Proserpina limen.
Troius Aeneas, pietate insignis et armis,
ad genitorem imas Erebi descendit ad umbras.
Si te nulla movet tantae pietatis imago,
at ramum hunc (aperit ramum, qui veste latebat)
adgnoscas.

The Sibyl, of course, is expert on all matters pertaining to the lower world. Yet she urges the admission of Aeneas on the basis of his peaceful errand, and puts forward his *pietas* as a sufficient ground for allowing him to enter the skiff, holding back the golden bough as a final argument, if the other fails. Vergil would hardly represent her as making such a proposal, if he had meant to imply in the earlier passage that the mere fact of transporting 'living bodies' was an infraction of law rendering Charon liable to punishment.

Looking backward, then, it becomes clear that if, with the words *Nec . . . sum laetus*, Charon is represented as referring to his own punishment,

Vergil means to say there that Charon was allowed some discretion in the matter of carrying over 'living bodies', and that he incurred a penalty for admitting persons who so shamefully abused the privilege.

Looked at from this angle, the insertion of the lines regarding the motives of the heroes in visiting the lower world is fully justified. But if this is the correct interpretation of the passage as a whole, Vergil has not expressed himself with his usual clearness. And Charon is made to appear as suffering for what in the main is the wrongdoing of others.

The question is raised, therefore, whether it is necessary to suppose that Vergil had in mind at all the punishment of Charon when he wrote this passage. The words *Nec . . . sum laetus* surely could bear a different interpretation, and one that fits far better in the context in which they stand.

For, though a link between two worlds, Charon distinctly belongs to the nether realm, and he identifies himself throughout with its interests; thus he says *nostra ad flumina* (388), and at 397 he speaks of '(our) queen'. Why then should he not 'deeply regret' directly on his own account that it was through his agency that Hercules and others found entrance, only to heap indignity and insult upon the dignitaries of the region? This is the simple and natural meaning of *Nec . . . sum laetus*; and, on the basis of that interpretation the thought of the whole passage is briefly as follows:

Charon.—'Stop where you are. It is against the rules to carry over living bodies. Even though they came with good credentials and threatened force, I subsequently had occasion to regret deeply making an exception in favor of Hercules, Theseus, and Pirithous, for the one dragged Cerberus away from the very throne of the king, and the others offered violence to our queen'.

Sibyl.—'No such designs are harbored here, and no attempt will be made to use force. There is no thought of molesting the dignitaries of the realm. Trojan Aeneas, a righteous man, desires merely to interview his father. Such *pietas* might well justify you in making an exception in his favor; but, if that is not enough, here is the golden branch'.

On this basis, everything fits perfectly, even to the final detail, wherein is described the effect of the sight of the golden branch upon Charon, namely: *Tumida ex ira tum corda residunt*. Up to that point he has been bristling like a watchdog, jealous lest any other marauder force a passage of the river. His suspicion and his resentment subside at the sight of the mystic token.

The bit of lore in regard to Charon's punishment which is unearthed by Servius and incorporated in his commentary is interesting enough. But the fact that there was such a tradition does not prove that this item was prominent in Vergil's mind when he wrote *Nec . . . sum laetus*; and still less may we be sure that this part of the story was so well known that the Roman reader would instinctively make the connection. It is much more probable that he would understand the passage as above explained.

Hence, quite apart from its failure to square with the suggestions of the Sibyl recorded in 399 ff., those who maintain the view that verse 392 refers to a punishment meted out to Charon for breaking the regulation forbidding the transportation of 'living bodies' will have to explain why Vergil uses so vague a phrase as *Nec . . . sum laetus* for a point that needs emphasis if the average reader is to follow the meaning, and then devotes three lines to details that are familiar to everyone, and which (under this interpretation) may fairly be called otiose.

Some may prefer to take the middle ground noted above, holding that Charon was punished because the persons he admitted abused the privilege. But, in addition to the objections which are entered against that interpretation, it is perhaps fair to point out that in general we are not justified in reading into the mind of an author every bit of erudition that some commentator happens to attach to a given text. The text indeed may prove an apt peg on which to hang the comment; but we should not allow the latter to deflect us from the course of the author's own thought. That Servius here has misled many seems obvious.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

'BRIEFLY SPEAKING' IN VERGIL

Commentators on Vergil rarely seem to think it worth while to note his curious use of *breviter* and *pauca* (*paucis*) with words of saying. Conington, on Aeneid 4. 333, attempts to explain how it is that a speech twenty-eight lines in length is called *pauca*. In Aeneid 6. 538, when the Sibyl has for the third time spoken *breviter*, he simply remarks that Vergil is "fond of advertizing to the brevity of the Sibyl's speeches". He might have added that Vergil as a rule is fond of alluding to the brevity of speeches, often where the term does not seem truly descriptive. In the Aeneid, *breviter* occurs nine times, *pauca* (*paucis*) occurs twelve times in connection with speeches. The shortest of these speeches begins with 9. 355, and is but two lines in length. The urgency of the situation is responsible for the brevity, *nam lux inimica propinquat*. Dido's haste to cut off her life as soon as possible, 4.631, supplies another urgent situation, though her speech, which she gave *breviter*, consists of seven lines. Perhaps in no other of the twenty-one cases is there any special need of haste, so that the reason for the use of the term

breviter or *pauca* (*paucis*) must be sought aside from the urgency.

The idea of comparison will explain some of these cases. This is clearly shown in 9.16, where the term *paucis* is applied to Jupiter's speech, which precedes, of ten lines, while Venus's speech, which follows, of forty-five lines, is characterized as *non pauca*. Probably the poet intended thus to contrast the decision of Jupiter's words with Venus's helpless rage. Jupiter's speech of six lines, 10. 622-627, following Juno's of fourteen, may be similarly explained. Perhaps also Dido's speech of seventeen lines, 1.562-578, is to be considered brief in comparison with that of Ilioneus, of thirty-seven lines, which it follows.

But such comparison will not account for Aeneas's 'brief' speech of twenty-nine lines, 4. 333-361, following Dido's speech of twenty-six; nor for the Sibyl's speech of nine lines, 6. 322-330, in answer to Aeneas's question of but three lines; nor for her speech of eight lines, 6.399-407, in reply to Charon's speech of ten lines; nor for several other similar cases. Comparison may be involved, but it is differently turned. It is comparison with what *might* be said. Thus, in 3.377 Helenus indicates that he will tell *pauca e multis*, *prohibent nam cetera Parcae scire Helenium farique vetat Saturnia Iuno*. The 'few things' make a speech of eighty-two lines, which we are led to believe is small in comparison with what might have been told, if Juno and the Fates had been willing. In like manner, the story of Troy's last agony fills an entire book, but it is brief in comparison with all that might be told. This is clearly the implication of 2.11. Such is the inference to be drawn from Dido's 'brief' speech, 4.634-640, for we are told in 630 that she had turned her mind on every consideration: *partis animum versabat in omnis*.

We get some light on the poet's attitude by observing his references to 'long' speeches. Perhaps none is quoted directly excepting those of Venus, referred to above, 10.18-62, and of Iarbas, 4.202-218. The last, consisting of thirteen lines, is characterized by *multa*, but it is really shorter than some of those described by *pauca*. Both cases involve a reference to the content of the speech. Venus's helpless rage and Iarbas's foolish raving appear long without regard to the actual number of lines. *Multa* goes with wild and unrestrained speaking. Compare 11.471, 12.601. The brief speech is apt to represent composure. And, even when the speech occupies an entire book, the self-control of the speaker suggests that the part told is brief in comparison with all he has suffered.

Another indirect light may be had by a reference to the poet's expression of thinking. We frequently find phrases like *plurima volvens*, *multa pulans*, *multa movens* used with Vergil's subjects. Aeneas considers every detail, 4.286: *in partisque rapit varias perque omnia versat*. He presses grief deep in his heart, 1.209: *premit altum corde dolorem*. Jupiter turns over his cares in his heart, 1.227: *illum talis iactantem pectore curas*.

Evidently, to Vergil's mind, thought might be varied and wide, but speech should be restrained. The terms *breviter* and *paucia* (*paucis*) reflect the poet's feeling that dignified, epic style suppresses as much as it tells.

CARLETON COLLEGE, NORTHFIELD, MINN. ARTHUR L. KEITH

A STRIKE OF THE TIBICINES

Professor Nutting's note in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.31, entitled *New or Old?*, suggests an incident which occurred in Rome in 311 B. C. and which also helps to bring home the lesson that many of the phases of modern life which we emphasize so strongly as being peculiarly modern had their counterpart among the Romans. The story is related in Livy 9.30.5-10, and deals with what we to-day would call a strike of the flute-players in Rome. Livy says that he would pass over the incident as a *res dictu parva*, if it did not seem to involve religion. The *tibicines*, prohibited by the last censors from feasting in the temple of Jupiter—a time-honored privilege of their *collegium*—, became angered and went off in a body to Tibur, leaving no one in the city to play at the sacrifices. The matter caused the Senate uneasiness, and envoys were dispatched to Tibur to see to it that the musicians should be sent back to Rome. The Tiburtines graciously promised to use their powers of persuasion, called the *tibicines* to the Senate-house, and urged them to return to the city. But the *tibicines* remained obdurate as strikers usually do under such circumstances, and the citizens of Tibur decided to use a stratagem in keeping with the nature of such people (*concilio haud abhorrente ab ingenii hominum*, says Livy). On a festival day they invited the flute-players to their several homes for the alleged purpose of having them furnish banquet music. Once the disgruntled players had appeared, the success of the ruse was assured, for they partook too freely of the wine which was offered them in liberal quantities and fell asleep. In this condition they were easily huddled into wagons and driven to Rome. The next morning, upon awakening, they found themselves in the midst of the Forum, with the sunlight beaming upon them. Crowds of curious spectators soon gathered. The *tibicines*, thus taken by surprise, promised, after some hesitation, to stay, but only on condition that their privileges and immunities be restored to them. These consisted of the right to parade through the city with music during three days every year, decked in their special garb and enjoying special freedom which in Livy's day had become traditional. To those who played at the sacrifices, moreover, the right of feasting in the temple of Jupiter was restored. Thus the strike, which took place while two wars of major importance—in Samnium and Etruria—were being waged, ended with the virtual victory of the strikers.

Valerius Maximus (2.5.4) tells practically the same story, but he does not specify who it was that deprived the *tibicines* of their right of feasting in the temple of

Jupiter. He adds, however, that the masks which they wore at festivals were meant to symbolize their sense of shame for having been thus outwitted in a state of intoxication.

Ovid, on the other hand, in the *Fasti* 6.651 ff., motivates the incident by an order of the aedile, based probably on the Twelve Tables, to the effect that not more than ten *tibicines* should play at any funeral. According to his version, furthermore, the ruse is carried out by an individual freedman of Tibur—with the same result. Plutarch, in the *Quaestiones Romanae* 55, relates the Ovidian version, but mentions an order of the *decemviri* as the cause of all the trouble, and, in his antiquarian interest, links the story with the custom of the *tibicines* to parade, disguised as women, on the Ides of January.

But the discrepancies in the various versions are beside the point. The interesting fact remains that there is presented to us in this story a *bona fide* Roman strike.

WASHINGTON D. C.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

THE DISINHERITED

That Old World so strangely beautiful
To us the disinherited of eld.

The above quotation, from Lowell's *Cathedral*, seems to the writer poignantly fitting to certain present-day educational conditions. In the current attacks upon so-called 'dead' languages, the clamor for things 'alive' and 'practical', the fact that all things of value in the modern world are more or less firmly rooted in the past, and that even the leaves of yesteryear are of value as fertilizers, if for nothing more, seems to be forgotten.

There is much striving after a wiser understanding of economic conditions, and strenuous efforts are being made to establish better international relations. One of the surest ways to understanding another race or nation is through an intimate and sympathetic study of its literature. Many a person thinks he knows Rome or Paris, and 'all about' the French or the Italians because he has spent a few months in France or in Italy; but he has gone to one or the other country full of ignorant prejudice, which he brings back more virulent than ever, because he has had no real contact with the people.

Many a youth, ambitious to enter some business in South America, begins the study of Spanish, with the idea that a speaking knowledge of the language is all he needs to fit him for a high place in the commercial world of one or more of the Latin Republics. The market has been flooded with Spanish conversation books and books on 'commercial Spanish', in order to give these ambitious lads the proper outfitting to enable them to reach the goal of their ambitions. Doubtless the American 'drummer' who returned from Colombia expressing the conclusion that "nobody can do business with those folks, an unprogressive lot, only interested in art and literature", was not, and for some time will not be, the last of his tribe.

A knowledge of Don Quijote, of the plays of Calderon or of the novels of Galdos will go much farther toward making a man popular in South America than the ability to talk with more or less fluent inaccuracy, in Spanish, on subjects connected with his own line of business. In short, if our young men expect to do business in any country, they must learn to understand and appreciate the outlook upon life of the people with whom they wish to establish relations, commercial or other.

It has long been recognized, even by beginners, that to the student of French some knowledge of Latin is very helpful in gaining an acquaintance with the structure and the vocabulary of the modern language. As one goes on with the study, and becomes acquainted with French literary artists, he realizes, more and more, the value of an understanding of the ways in which words have gained or lost or have been transfigured in meaning by the passage of the centuries. That is to say, he arrives at this realization, if he knows something of Latin. How pathetic is his condition if he has no consciousness of his loss! How shall he appreciate *Les Frères Ennemis* if he knows nothing of *The Seven against Thebes*, or *Andromaque* if he is ignorant of the *Iliad* or of the *Aeneid*? What does the *Brittanicus* mean to the reader who has no first-hand acquaintance with Seneca or with the history of the Rome of the Caesars? Who can see even dimly the perfection of classic form in the works of Chénier, *Le Conte de Lisle*, or *De Hérédia*, if he knows not Theocritus or Catullus?

When one hears a class attempting to translate French poetry, how intensely he realizes how much of the meaning and the flavor is lost by the reader who has no faintest conception of the ways by which the present-day meanings of words have been distilled through passing seasons and centuries from the ancient vocabularies of Greece and Rome!

These things are, if possible, even more true of Spanish and Italian. Latin culture preserved its pristine vigor longer in Spain than elsewhere outside the Peninsula of its birth. Hence, despite the changes wrought by Goth and Saracen, the Spanish sentence preserves more nearly than another the sonorous periodicity of the tongue of Cicero.

Once upon a time students considered Italian and Spanish 'easy'. In those golden days, they came to the study of the Romance languages with some knowledge of Latin and sometimes even of Greek. Their successors of the present time are at a loss, not only in reading the lyric poets of the Renaissance, who began their every sonnet "to a mistress' eye-brow" with an obscure, but, as a rule, appropriate classical allusion. They discover the inner significance of the elder De Hérédia's *Ode to Niagara*, or of Luaces's *Cyrus Field* and *Hymn to Labor* only by dint of much thumbing of the classical dictionary, and of Bullfinch's *Age of Fable*, or Gayley's *Classic Myths*. For all Spanish literature drips classical allusions and references.

The student of Romance languages, becoming daily a more and more *rara avis* who has prolonged his

study of Latin sufficiently to have made acquaintance with Horace, and that still rarer creature who has read Lucretius, enjoys himself thoroughly and excites the wondering envy of his fellows by his effortless grasp of the meaning and his savoring of the aroma of the Spanish novelists, from *Lazarillo de Tormes* to the latest productions of Marmol, Ibañez, or Rizal, or of all the poets and the dramatists from *Cancionero del Cid* to the work of Galdos or the Quintero brothers.

If the modern student who considers Greek and Latin 'dead' languages finds the Spanish authors a succession of uncharted regions, what must be his fate when he joins battle with even the latest-born geniuses of the old Latin soil—Carducci, say, or the doughty d'Annunzio?

Nor are the classic references, allusions, echoes, and flavors the only difficulty which the present-day student finds in the Italian authors. These have always been conscious of their Roman heritage. Latin is to them merely an older form of their native tongue, in a deeper and more intimate sense than is Chaucerian English to the typical American College student. Consequently, when an Italian writer needs to express a shade of meaning not conveyed by any Italian word in common use, he modernizes the necessary Latin word by giving it the appropriate ending. And the bewildered American youth 'can't find it in the dictionary' and is at stale-mate.

The most determined advocate of the 'modern' and 'practical' in education needs to learn that he who would go far in Mathematics, Political Science, Sociology, Penology, or Psychology stops short of his best if he is not acquainted with the things the Italians have done in these and kindred subjects.

Our international relations are perhaps the subjects of most immediate and intimate concern to every thinking American who loves his country. We must, each and all, understand the problems, not only of South and Central America, but of Italy, Spain, the Balkans, and Japan, from the point of view of the intelligent natives of those countries. For an intelligent understanding of the problems of most of these countries through an acquaintance with their languages and literatures, we need far more classic lore than any but the most exceptional of our College students of to-day are acquiring.

Moreover, there is, in the present neglect of the thought and the expression of Greece and Rome, as well as of Palestine, a distinct loss of that intellectual and spiritual force which is the world's most imperative need. How shall we regain and hold, for the present and all time to come, this vanishing heritage?

GRINNELL, COLLEGE GRINNELL, IOWA CAROLINE SHELDON

REVIEWS

De Bruma et Brumalibus Festis. By John Raymond Crawford. Harvard University Dissertation. Printed in *Byzantinischer Zeitschrift* 23.3-4 (pages 365-396).

Dr. Crawford's thesis *De Bruma et Brumalibus Festis* covers thirty pages of subject-matter, in Latin, and a bibliography of two pages. The latter is equally divided between the ancient authorities (the original sources), and modern writers on the two festivals. It is not only the latest, but by far the most careful and searching investigation ever made of two festivals which are little known. Dr. Crawford's work is both a description of the celebrations and an effort to clear away the mists of obscurity and misunderstanding in which the festivals have long been shrouded. He has presented his subject chronologically, except in the chapter dealing with Lydus's account of the origins of the Brumalia. This method of presentation was, doubtless, better adapted to a detailed study of sources and secondary authorities, of which the thesis consists. Nevertheless, as it seems to me, a reviewer can secure greater clarity and render fuller justice to the author's purpose by abandoning the chronological order and turning at once to the Byzantine Brumalia and its problems.

From the beginning of the sixth century A. D. to the middle of the tenth, a festival, known as the Brumalia, flourished at Constantinople. It began on November 24 and continued until December 17; each of the twenty-four days thus included was designated by a letter of the Greek alphabet. During this festival it was customary for one to entertain each of his friends with a banquet on the day marked with that letter with which his name began.

Among other features of the festival, as we learn from Lydus, *De Mensibus* 4.158, was the slaying of a pig in December, a custom which belonged also to the ancient Roman Saturnalia. Moreover, the Byzantine Brumalia was actually called a festival of Cronos, and December 17, the day on which it closed, was the opening day of the Saturnalia. Forcellini and Cumont (the latter in *Revue de Philologie* 21, 149, n.2) regarded the Brumalia as identical with the Saturnalia. To this conclusion Forcellini was led by the fact that Martial (12.81) uses the words Bruma and Saturnalia interchangeably.

But Lydus, *De Mensibus* 4.158, in discussing the origins of the Brumalia, mentions the custom known as *ascalia*, which was a famous feature of the old Athenian Lesser Dionysia. Furthermore, the testimony of Canon 62 of the Council in Trullo, of the year 692 A. D.¹, proves that there were certain Dionysiac rites lingering on in the seventh century of our era, and Balzamon, Tzetzes, and Zonaras, twelfth century Byzantine writers, affirm that the Brumalia was a festival of Dionysus, inasmuch as *βροῦμος* was an epithet of that god. It is a fact that at this festival, in the eighth century, the Emperor Constantine Copronymus revered Dionysus and Broumos as creators of corn and wine.

Hence Du Cange explained the Brumalia as a Roman festival in honor of Bacchus. A different view of the origin of the Brumalia is expressed by Ioannes Malalas, the sixth century Byzantine chronographer, an ex-

planation which, he says, he derived from the Roman annalist Licinius.

According to Malalas, Romulus instituted the Brumalia in order to relieve the opprobrium he had incurred in partaking of the food of his foster-father, Faustulus, for up to that time it had been deemed a disgrace to eat the bread of one not a blood relative. And so a festival was instituted at which every one was entertained by some one outside his family. This, says Malalas, was called, in the Latin tongue, *βροῦμαλιουμ*; the entertainment took place on different days according to the position in the alphabet of the initial letter of one's name.

In considering this story of the origin of the Brumalia, Dr. Crawford, on page 371, revives and gives prominence to a half-forgotten theory of Tomaschek, first advanced in 1868, in *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften*, at Vienna, that the whole account is "Hirngespinst eines Byzantiners". In the Licinius mentioned by Malalas Dr. Crawford recognizes, I think correctly, the Roman annalist Licinius Macer. He further recognizes in a fragment of the latter, preserved by Macrobius, the very passage on which Malalas drew. In my opinion the character of the passage hardly warrants this last conclusion, but the aetiological nature of Malalas's story, to which Dr. Crawford next draws attention, is unquestionable. The tale is obviously concocted to explain what Malalas and his imitators fancy to be the etymology of Brumalia, a word which Malalas renders once in this passage by *βροῦμαλιουμ*, in support of his theory that Brumalia is derived from *βρῶμα*, 'food', and *alium*, in the sense of *alienum*.

Not only is Malalas's story of too aetiological a character to be worthy of credence, but Dr. Crawford emphasizes in particular the very different account of the origin of the festival which is given by Lydus, *De Mensibus* 4.158. This account, which scholars have heretofore neglected, Dr. Crawford makes it a primary aim of his thesis to subject to the most detailed examination, rendering to it the prominence and the weight to which it is entitled. Lydus differs altogether from Malalas, specifically stating that entertainment according to the letter of the alphabet with which a man's name began was of later growth. There is evidence that the alphabetical fashion of entertainment was in vogue in the reign of Justinian, and a little earlier, under Anastasius (491-518 A. D.), but there is no evidence before the close of the fifth century of entertainment according to the alphabet throughout a period of twenty-four days. It is true that Constantine Porphyrogenitus, writing in the tenth century, states that Constantine I, Theodosius I, Marcianus, and Leo I celebrated the Brumalia, but he does not mention the form or the duration of the festival under those Emperors.

Now, Tertullian and Cassianus Bassus (a Byzantine writer of the sixth or of the beginning of the seventh century) refer to an old Roman festival known as the Bruma, which occurred on November 24. This day, it must be remembered, was the day on which the

¹A misprint on page 385 dates this council in 632.

Byzantine Brumalia began. Mommsen, however, in C. I. L. i², page 287, and Habler, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie, under *bruma*, make no distinction between this Bruma of Tertullian's time and the Byzantine twenty-four day festival, but ascribe to the Bruma the duration and the alphabetical plan of entertainment found in the Byzantine Brumalia. Yet Cassianus Bassus quotes Florentinus, a Roman author of the reign of Alexander Severus, and Didymus, a Greek of the fourth or the fifth century A. D., to the effect that the festival of the Bruma occurred on November 24.

Moreover, the calendars of Silvius and Philocalus, which date from the fourth and the fifth centuries respectively, both enter, under November 24, the name Bruma. Mommsen maintains that this entry does not refer to a festival day, but merely heralds the coming of the winter solstice, or true *bruma*, one month later. He understands the word as designating a period of time beginning November 24 and ending December 25, the day of the true *bruma*. He believes that Philocalus merely transferred from the end of this period of time to its beginning an epithet usually applied only to the end, and he quotes Pliny to the effect that the best writers designate the summer solstice by the word *solstitium*, the winter solstice by the word *bruma*. Bruma, then, under November 24 in Philocalus's calendar he understands as the first day of a period of that name, ending in the true *bruma*, or winter solstice, on December 25; and so the entry *Bruma*, he maintains, is balanced in this calendar against the entry *Solstitium* for June 24.

To this Dr. Crawford objects that, if Philocalus had intended to use the word Bruma as a parallel to *Solstitium* under June 24, he would have entered it under the day of the true *bruma*, not under November 24. He urges, moreover, that, had Philocalus been treating of a period of time, he would have noted not merely the beginning but the end as well, the day of the winter solstice, which, however, he omits altogether from his calendar. Silvius, on the other hand, has recorded both days in the words *solstitium et initium hiberni*, under December 25, and *Bruma*, under November 24. Had Silvius, says Dr. Crawford, intended by this entry to indicate not a festival but only an introductory day to the true *bruma*, he would not have designated the latter as *solstitium*, but would have employed the term *bruma* of both days.

In my opinion, it would be difficult to decide against Mommsen, were it not (1) for the passages cited above from Florentinus and Didymus; (2) for the testimony of Lydus, that the alphabetical mode of entertainment at the Brumalia was of later origin—evidence which Mommsen wholly ignores; and (3) for the aetiological nature of Malalas's account of the origin of the festival, which Mommsen fails to consider. In his first paragraph, Dr. Crawford states that two of his primary aims have been (1) to redirect the attention of scholars to the unreliability of Malalas, first pointed out by Tomaschek, in 1868, and (2) adequately to present and examine the passage in Lydus, which has hitherto

been overlooked, except in the incomplete and inaccurate treatment accorded to it by Cumont, *Revue De Philologie* 21, 149, note 2, and Trew, *ibidem*.

The result of Dr. Crawford's labors is convincing. He is the first to collect and weigh properly all the evidence concerning the festivals of the Bruma and the Brumalia. His conclusion is that there was an old Roman festival known as the Bruma², which preceded the true *bruma*, the winter solstice, by one month, and constituted a prelude or introduction to it; that this festival was held on November 24; that in the time of Constantine the Great and his earlier successors both this festival and the Saturnalia were probably celebrated independently at Constantinople, and that in the intervening period (between November 24 and December 17) certain of the rites of Dionysus and Demeter belonging to this season continued to be celebrated; that out of these three elements was evolved the Byzantine Brumalia, which derived its name from the initial one of the several ancient festivals of which it was composed, not from *βροῦμος* or *βρῶμα*, which are false etymologies invented by the Byzantine writers after the true origin of the Brumalia had been forgotten; that it was the coincidence of this festival's extent over twenty-four days, a number identical with that of the letters of the Greek alphabet, which led to the custom of entertaining at dinner in alphabetical order, and that the evidence at our disposal indicates that this custom did not arise before the close of the fifth century A. D., during the reign of Anastasius.

Finally, Dr. Crawford shows the error of Polites, and of Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, 226, in confusing the Brumalia with the New Year festival, which lasted down into the fifteenth century. There is no evidence, he says, to prove the existence of the Brumalia after the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus, that is, the tenth century.

In addition to settling the principal problems which his subject presented, Dr. Crawford has disposed, in passing, of a number of minor problems, and has given a history of the celebration of the Brumalia in the various centuries of its existence.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY HORACE WETHERILL WRIGHT

The History of Religions. By E. Washburn Hopkins. New York: The Macmillan Company (1918). Pp. 624. \$3.00.

Within the compass of this single volume Professor Hopkins has given a vast deal of information, well-ordered and clearly presented. Beginning with a couple of chapters on the definitions of religion, the sources from which our knowledge is derived, the classifications of religions, and the general characteristics of primitive religions, he discusses in turn a large number of religions, moving in general from the more primitive to the more advanced, thus ending his book

²This apparently did not antedate Martial, as that poet is ignorant of a festival of that name separate from the Saturnalia.

with three chapters on Greek Religion, The Religion of the Romans, and The Religion of Christ and Christianity.

For readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* the religions of Greece and Rome are of chief interest, and therefore the present brief notice will confine itself to them. The outline of the relation of Greek (Achaean) religion to the Cretan and 'Pelasgian' elements is excellent, as is the account of the gods of the aristocratic classes and of their worship. After this, Professor Hopkins shows how social changes and the influence of country life produced a movement away from the aristocratic religion. The development of the Eleusinian Mysteries through the union of the cult of Demeter with that of Dionysus in the seventh century, and the spread of a refined Dionysiac religion in the sixth, satisfied a personal interest in religion which the older forms had not met, for the former showed how man could overcome death, while the latter taught him how he might become divine. About the same time, philosophy began its conflict with popular thought in which it was finally to win and to establish for all generations since the forms of religious thought and expression. The course of religious history in Greece, the union of morality and religion, the coming of manifold new religions, and the final course of religious philosophies through Neoplatonism are well sketched, although the beginner is likely to find the condensation somewhat excessive and to desire more explanation at certain points than his small space allows the author to give. But all will appreciate the effective way in which Professor Hopkins presents the significance of Greek religion. One sentence I must quote (514):

Apart therefore from the clarity and logical brilliancy of Greek thought, apart also from the beauty which has transfused all she received and created, there remains the unique character of her genius, which united ethics and metaphysics into a religion based not on superstition but on philosophy, not on faith but on logic, yet in which due place was given to emotion.

The chapter on Roman Religion is also to be recommended for its comprehensiveness and clarity. The problems are somewhat less complex than in Greek religion, in which philosophy plays such an important part. The layman will find here the nature of religion and the characters of the *numina* among the early Romans well described; and he will be able to see clearly the ways in which the circle of the gods was extended and the concepts of the divinities were modified through Italian, Greek, and Oriental influences. The emphasis which Professor Hopkins lays on the importance of taking into account those rites and practices which made up the religion of the peasant as contrasted with that of the State is welcome; for even scholars sometimes fall into the error of presenting the formal cult of the Great Gods as the actual religion of Rome, which is a procedure as incorrect as that which reports the formal creeds and practice of the Christian Church as the Christianity of the modern European Peasant. The account is carried down to the end of the fourth century; the chapter closes

with a suggestive paragraph on the survivals of Roman influence, especially of the concept of religion as primarily law.

The carping critic, however, cannot forbear to express his regret that so accurate a scholar as Professor Hopkins should hand on the traditional error (542) that Cato wondered how an *augur* could keep from laughing when he met his fellow. The augurs moved in the best society; but the *haruspices* lived below the stairs (Cicero, *De Divinatione* 2. 51).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

CLIFFORD H. MOORE

CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

America—June 11, Keep the Classics But Teach Them, Francis P. Donnelly.

American Historical Review—April, A History of the Art of Writing, William A. Mason, reviewed by R. W. Rogers [the book needs vigorous revision: see also *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.175-176]; Le Travail dans la Grèce Ancienne: Histoire Économique de la Grèce depuis la Période Homérique jusqu'à la Conquête Romaine, Gustave Glotz, reviewed by W. L. Westermann [a good book]; The History of the Chalcidic League, A. B. West, reviewed by W. S. Ferguson; Schools of Gaul: A Study of Pagan and Christian Education in the Last Century of the Western Empire, Theodore Haarhoff, reviewed by C. C. Mierow.—July, German Historians and Macedonian Imperialism, John R. Knippling [a study of the spirit and degree of historical accuracy which German historians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have reflected in their treatment of the Macedonian expansion under Philip II, 358-338 B. C. The writer holds that their studies are in crying need of revision]; Manuel d'Archéologie Romaine, R. Cagnat and V. Chapot, reviewed by R. V. D. Magoffin.

American Journal of International Law—July, Greek Interstate Associations and the League of Nations, A. E. R. Boak.

American Magazine of Art—April, News Letter from Rome, G. P. Stevens [Director of the American Academy in Rome].

Archiv für Religionswissenschaft—XX, 1, Griechische und Römische Religion, 1911-1914, L. Deubner.

Art and Archaeology—Aug., The Reconstruction of the Nashville Parthenon, George J. Zolnay [illustrated].

Atlantic Monthly—Sept., Things Seen and Heard, Edgar J. Goodspeed.

Biblical Review—April, The Old Believers in Rome and the Dusk of the Gods, E. G. Sihler [deals with the last struggle, in the fourth century, of classic paganism and Christianity].

Bulletin of High Points in the Work of the High Schools in New York City—Jan., 1920, The New Latin Syllabus, Ernst Riess [a discussion of the Latin Syllabus, for the Four Year High School, lately adopted in New York State].—Feb., 1920, Visual Instruction in Latin [includes list of slides, illustrating Roman topography, life, etc., available at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York City].—May, 1920, Methods and Devices in Latin, J. W. Connell.—June, 1920, Vitalizing Vergil; Archaeology in the High Schools, Helen H. Tanzer.—May, Latin Week at Bay Ridge High School.—June,

Relieving the Monotony of Drill in First Year Latin: Overcoming the Difficulties of Nepos in Second Year Latin.—Sept., Setting a "Marking Period" Test in Latin. [This Bulletin is published by the Board of Education, 500 Park Avenue, New York City].

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library—Jan., The Present Position of Papyrology, B. P. Grenfell; Celsus and Aristides, J. Rendell Harris; Hand-List of Additions to Latin Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library, Robert Fawtier.

Burlington Magazine—April, Römische und Römanische Paläste, K.M. Swoboda, reviewed by A. G. S. B. [the book traces descent of palace and villa design from the first century to the twelfth].

The Campion (published at Campion College, Prairie Du Chien, Wisconsin)—March, Vicus Desertus, Anthony F. Geyser [a page from Father Geyser's Latin version of Goldsmith, *Deserted Village*, which = *Musa Americana*, Fourth Series]; Rupes Pictae, A. F. Geyser [86 Latin hexameters, dealing with Campion College].—May, M. Antoni Oratio Funebra: *Iuli Caesaris Fabulæ Shakespearianaæ*, Act. III, Scaena 2, 82-207, A. F. Geyser.

Chicago Commerce—April 30, Latin for "Business Education", Roy C. Flickinger.

Cornell Alumni News—June 9, Cultural VS. Materialistic Education, Paul Shorey [an address delivered at the First Cornell Convention, May 13].

Deutsche Literaturzeitung—Nov. 13, 1920, Studien zur Griechisch-Römischen Komödie, K. Kunst, reviewed by A. Körte.—Nov. 27, Untersuchungen zu Xenophons Hellenica, A. Banderet, reviewed by E. von Stern; Die Germania des Tacitus, edited by K. Müllenhoff, revised by M. Roediger, reviewed by Georg Wissowa.—Dec. 11, Die Entstehung und Religiöse Bedeutung des Griechischen Kalendars, M. P. Nilson, reviewed by Otto Weinrich.

Deutsche Rundschau—March, Homer der Fahrende Dichter, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf.

Dial—March, A Roman Letter, R. Aldington.—April, Translations from the Anacreontic Poems, E. A. Ashwin [in verse].

Discovery—Jan.-Feb., Discoveries in Crete, George Glasgow.

Educational Review—April, Shall it Be Latin or Greek?, Haven D. Brackett.

English Review—April, An Introduction to the Study of Terra Sigillata, F. Oswald and T. D. Price, reviewed by A. E. Van Buren ["It will form . . . probably the classic English text-book . . . on the study of Roman red-glaze pottery"].

Flower Grower—March, Latin and Greek in Horticulture, Frank B. Meyer.

The Freeman—March 2, Towards a Humanist Synthesis, Lewis Mumford [a suggestion of a way to remove the conflict between literature and science].

High School Journal (published at the University of North Carolina)—May, The Latin Column [Latin Bulletin of the High School, Asheville, N. C., Latin Derivatives Exercise, Some Principles of Roman Law, Vocabulary Work].

Historical Outlook—Nov., Ancient History a "Living" Thing, Frances N. Ahl.

Historische Zeitschrift—CXXIII, 1, Die Entstehung der Römischen Nobilität, M. Gelzer.

Indiana University, Bulletin of the Extension Division—Dec., 1920, Pictures from Roman Life, Lillian Gay

Berry [lists of lantern-slides illustrating Roman home life, dress, education, travel, amusements, industrial arts, crafts and trades, art, and Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*].

Journal Des Savants—Nov., Le Commerce Romain dans la Méditerranée Orientale, M. Besnier.

Klio—XVI, 3, Die Letzten Ziele der Politik Alexanders des Grossen, E. Kornemann.—XVII, 1, König Romulus bei Ennius, G. Wigwart; Römische Kaiserdaten, IV, L. Holzapfel.

Maryland School Bulletin—Sept., The Teaching of High School Latin [a pamphlet issued by the State Department of Education, Baltimore].

Mercurie De France—March 15, L'Avenir Archéologique de la Syrie, G. Contenau [a discussion of the importance of the archaeological investigations possible under the French Mandate].

Methodist Quarterly Review—Oct., 1920, The Apocalypse, R. B. Steele [of interest in various ways to students of the Classics. Professor Steele holds that the Apocalypse was written shortly after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, 70 A. D.].

Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bulletin of—Aug., Loan of Terracottas from Crete, M. E. C. [illustrated].

Mind—Jan., Plato's Misconception of Morality, E. Hale [a discussion of an article in Mind, October, 1919, in which Mr. Leon had discovered, in the Republic, a "defect" which led him to conclude that Plato was a Nietzschean. Mr. Hale thinks that the chief misconception in all this is Mr. Leon's].

The Monist—April, Parmenides and Authority, George Boas.—July, Aristotle and the Criterion of Truth, James Lindsay.

Music and Letters—Jan., To Lesbia, After Catullus, Renwell Rodd [a rhymed version of Catullus 5].

Nation and Athenaeum (London)—March 12, The Oresteia at Cambridge, E. J. Dent [the author comments enthusiastically upon the effect produced by presenting the trilogy as a whole, with the assistance of music which takes the unity into account, and uses the technical methods of Wagner to emphasize the unity] Loeb Classics [an unsigned review of translations of Herodotus, Volume 1, by A. D. Godley, of Plato, Volume 2, by H. N. Fowler, of Sallust, by J. C. Rolfe, and of Quintilian, Volume 1, by H. E. Butler].—March 26, Old Learning Renewed [comments on New Studies of a Great Inheritance, R. S. Conway; a plea for the value of the Classics in a new light, and with a new synthesis].

New Statesman—March 12, The Greek Play at Cambridge, Arnold Bennett [Mr. Bennett can see little good in such performances; to him "as a form of artistic activity <the Greek play> denotes a decadence of taste on the part of all concerned"].—March 26, The Spirit of Rome [favorable comment on New Studies of a Great Inheritance: Being Lectures on the Modern Worth of Some Ancient Writers, R. S. Conway. The book, which treats the lives of some great Romans, is characterized as a "charming and subtle book"].

North American Review—April, Good Friday and Classical Professors, Stark Young [the author believes that classical professors fail to get the full passion and color of ancient life and art, and recommends the Good Friday Procession at Girgenti as a good starting-point for the needed enlightenment].

BARNARD COLLEGE

GRACE H. GOODALE
CHARLES KNAPP